



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/823,324	04/13/2004	Franklin Fulton Simpson	BEAS-01260US2	4474
23910	7590	04/02/2008		
FLIESLER MEYER LLP			EXAMINER	
650 CALIFORNIA STREET			MITCHELL, JASON D	
14TH FLOOR				
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94108			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2193	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/02/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/823,324	Applicant(s) SIMPSON, FRANKLIN FULTON
	Examiner Jason Mitchell	Art Unit 2193

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 January 2008.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1,18-35 and 37-48 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1,18-35 and 37-48 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 1/16/08
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1, 18-35 and 37-48 are pending in this application.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 1/16/08 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In the last full par. on pg. 10, the Applicant states:

Claim 1 (previously in claim 17) requires "wherein the management domain is a collection of distributed servers that are managed as a unit." The Office Action asserted that the table in col. 10 of Viswanath anticipated this feature. However, that particular table describes a meta-information file describing application configuration information. Viswanath does not disclose or suggest a management domain that "is a collection of distributed servers that are managed as a unit."

The examiner respectfully disagrees. Viswanath discloses installing an MBean on a distributed server (see e.g. Fig. 5, Administration server 200 and Managed beans 212A). Viswanath further discloses a 'management domain' including a collection of servers (col. 12, lines 42-60 "Configuration context 206 may be used by the "above" layers (e.g. management and data presentation layers)") and further discloses servers in this domain can be "managed as a unit" (col. 12, lines 42-60 "configuration context 206 may be used to write to multiple storages on different machines with a single operation") and that the servers are "in a management domain" (col. 12, lines 42-60 "a configuration context 206 may be created for each server during server initialization"). Additionally it is not clear that a domain or 'collection of servers' necessarily requires a plurality of servers. In other words it would appear that a domain could be defined to

include only a single server (i.e. a 'collection' of one). In which case, any managed server would necessarily be "in" a management domain. However for the sake of this examination the limitation will be read as reciting "the management domain is a collection of [two or more] distributed servers".

In the par. bridging pp. 10-11, the Applicant states:

Claim 1 (previously in claim 36) requires that the "scope of an MBean is a set of locations at which the MBean is available, and an MBean is not available to servers located outside the MBean's scope; and wherein an administration server contains a copy of all sharable MBeans located in the management domain." The Office Action cited col. 2, lines 37-40, which simply noted that "components may be deployed on different servers in a network" and Fig. 3, which showed Generated managed beans 212. The person skilled in the art would not accept the cited portions of Viswanath as disclosing the requirements of Claim 1. Furthermore, Viswanath does not appear to teach or otherwise suggest scope of a MBean or sharable MBeans.

The examiner respectfully disagrees. First it is noted that the claim does not recite any limitations defining particular aspects of the claimed MBean's scope (e.g. wherein the MBean scope does/does not extend beyond the server it is installed on), but merely states that the MBean has a scope. A 'scope' is an inherent aspect of any MBean, and for that matter any object. In other words any installed bean will be accessible from some locations (e.g. the server on which it is installed) and not others (e.g. another server which cannot communicate with the first server and does not have its own instance of the bean). Accordingly, this limitation does not represent a distinction over Viswanath's disclosure.

In the second full par. on pg. 11 (labeled Claim 21), the Applicant asserts:

Art Unit: 2193

Claim 21 requires "wherein the custom management capability is customized by a user by adding schema attributes and extended persistence features." The Office Action asserted that Viswanath col. 12, "Configuration API 222 functionality may include, but is limited to, one or more of, basic configuration operations (e.g. get and set elements and attributes APIs), event notification, cloning, bean lookup mechanism (e.g. XPath) support, change management (e.g. add, update, delete, set) ..." disclosed these features. However, the cited portions of Viswanath do not teach or suggest that "the custom management capability is customized by a user by adding schema attributes and extended persistence features."

The examiner respectfully disagrees. , Viswanath discloses user customization of the MBeans (col. 14, lines 22-24 "meta-information 226 file may be generated by users ... the framework generator 224 may generate ... components", see also col. 14 lines 31-33). Still further, those of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that the cited "get and set elements and attributes" and "change management" anticipate the claimed schema attributes and persistence features. Editing properties of the beans constitutes customizing the schema (e.g. makeup of the bean).

In the par. bridging pp. 11-12 (labeled Claim 22), the Applicant asserts:

Claim 22 requires "wherein the custom management capability is packaged as a framework with multiple MBeans which a security provider can extend." The Office Action asserted that Viswanath col. 5, line 55, "dynamic administration framework" disclosed these features. While the cited portion of Viswanath does recite the word "framework," Viswanath does not teach or [suggest] that Viswanath's framework is packaged with multiple MBeans which a security provider can extend.

The examiner respectfully disagrees. In col. 15, lines 31-41 Viswanath discloses "the users may represent the configuration information in a meta-information file". This shows a user (e.g. a security provider) can extend the functionality of the MBeans being generated.

In the first full par. on pg. 12 (labeled Claim 23) the applicant states:

Claim 23 requires, "wherein a MBean is accessed through a type MBean stub." The Office Action asserted that Viswanath col. 10, lines 29-50, taught the features of claim 23. Yet col. 10 describes meta-information accessed by a generator to generate beans. Viswanath does not teach or suggest "an MBean is accessed through a type MBean stub."

The examiner respectfully disagrees. Further, those of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized the cited "get" and "set" methods as providing a direct access to attributes and operations of the custom MBean and thus as anticipate the claimed MBean stub.

In the second full par. on pg. 12 (labeled Claim 24) the applicant states:

Claim 24 requires, "wherein an MBean stub provides a reference to a java object which implements an interface specific to the MBean." The Office Action asserted that Viswanath col. 10, lines 29-50, taught the features of claim 23. Yet col. 10 describes meta-information accessed by a generator to generate beans. Viswanath does not teach or suggest "an MBean stub provides a reference to a java object which implements an interface specific to the MBean."

The examiner respectfully disagrees. Viswanath discloses the generation and use of MBeans (e.g. col. 20, lines 9-11 "the management beans 212 generated by the generator mechanism 224 may be MBeans ... that adhere to the JMX standards") including the claimed stubs (col. 10, line 42-43 A bean may also include "get" and "set" methods for the attributes of the corresponding elements."). These "get" and "set" methods provide an implementation of an interface specific to the MBean as claimed.

In the last par. on pg. 12 (labeled Claim 25), the applicant states:

Claim 25 requires, "wherein stubs are generated dynamically at runtime." The Office Action asserted that Viswanath col. 10, lines 29-50, taught the features of claim 23. Yet col. 10 describes meta-information accessed by a generator to generate beans. Viswanath does not teach or suggest "wherein stubs are generated dynamically at runtime."

The examiner respectfully disagrees. Viswanath discloses run time generation of the MBeans and the associated stubs addressed above (col. 10, lines 51-53 "the generator mechanism 224 may generate a bean 250").

In the first par. on pg. 13 (labeled Claim 34), the applicant states:

Claim 34 requires "wherein a local MBean server handles read attribute requests and MBean creation and deletion requests for server specific MBeans." The Office Action asserted that Viswanath col. 17, lines 36-39 "API 222 may provide a generic interface to manage (e.g. create, read..., write and/or delete) ... the generated configuration [beans] 210" disclosed these features. However, the cited portion of Viswanath describes a configuration API, it does not describe "a local MBean server handles read attribute requests and MBean creation and deletion requests for server specific MBeans." Furthermore, Viswanath does not appear to disclose or suggest "server specific MBeans."

The examiner respectfully disagrees. Viswanath discloses 'Application Servers' (see e.g. Fig. 3, Application Server 200) containing the cited API 222 (e.g. API 222). Accordingly a statement that these APIs "manage (e.g. create, read ..., write and/or delete)" anticipates a local server (e.g. Application Server 200) handling read attribute, creation, and deletion requests for the MBeans (e.g. Generated configuration beans 210). Further, as can be seen in Fig. 4, Viswanath indicates at least 2 distinct sets of Generated Beans (e.g. Generated beans 250B and C). Thus the beans of each server are specific to that server.

Art Unit: 2193

In the second par. on pg. 13 (labeled Claim 35), the applicant asserts:

Claim 35 requires "wherein an MBean Server Proxy routes read access to an appropriate server and MBean instance within the appropriate server and routes write accesses to the corresponding MBean instance on the administration server." The Office Action cited Viswanath Fig. 1A, Web Server 104 and Application Server 108A-B as disclosing these features. However, Fig. 1A describes a Web Server and an Application Server, it does not disclose "wherein an MBean Server Proxy routes read access to an appropriate server and MBean instance within the appropriate server and routes write accesses to the corresponding MBean instance on the administration server." Furthermore, Viswanath does not appear to disclose or suggest an MBean Server Proxy routing read access to a server with a MBean and write access to an administration server with a corresponding MBean instance."

The examiner respectfully disagrees. In col. 8, line 64-col. 9, line 5 Viswanath disclose "web servers may ... receive requests ... and broker the requests to application servers". This 'brokering' action provided by the web servers is equivalent to the claimed "rout[ing] read access to an appropriate server" and further is 'brokering' access to MBeans (col. 20, lines 9-10 "the management beans ... may be MBeans"). Thus Viswanath anticipates the claimed "MBean Server Proxy".

In the first par. on pg. 14 (labeled Claim 37) the applicant states:

Claim 37 requires that "changes to an MBean are propagated from an administration server to all servers within the scope of the MBean." The Office Action cited Viswanath col. 16, lines 4-18, which stated (on lines 15-18): "the changes may be serialized and sent to one or more other application servers that have a global configuration context in memory and that have registered listeners." The cited portion of Viswanath does not appear to teach or otherwise suggest "servers within the scope of the MBean."

The examiner respectfully disagrees. Further, a "server 202 [which] registers a listener ... to listen for change notification events" (see col. 16, lines 4-15) for a particular MBean is within the scope of that MBean (also see col. 16, lines 15-18 "The

changes may be serialized and sent to ... servers 202 ... that have registered listeners").

In the second par. on pg. 14 (labeled Claim 38), the applicant states:

Claim 38 requires that "applications and servers must go to a particular server to read a server-specific MBean." The Office Action cited Viswanath, col. 15, lines 17-18, "In one embodiment, user applications may not be deployed to an administration server." However, this cited portion of Viswanath simply states that in one embodiment the administration server and the application server are different servers. The cited portion of Viswanath does not teach or suggest that "applications and servers must go to a particular server to read a server-specific MBean." Furthermore, Viswanath does not appear to teach or otherwise suggest server-specific MBeans.

The examiner respectfully disagrees. By definition, a server-specific MBean must be read from that specific server (i.e. it is not installed on any other server). As discussed above Viswanath discloses server specific MBeans (e.g. the difference between Generated beans 205B and 205C shown in Fig. 4). Referring to fig. 4, in order to read a bean which is contained in Generated beans 205B but not in Generated beans 205C (or A) an application or server would need to go to Application server 202B because the desired bean is not on Application Server 202C (or Administration server 200).

In the par. bridging pp. 14-15 (labeled Claims 40-42), the applicant states:

Claim 40 requires "wherein the scope is specified in the MBean definition file." The Office Action conceded that Viswanath does not disclose scope. However, the Office Action asserted that Johnson (U. S. patent no. 6,788,980) col. 23, lines 17-18, "supports the implementation of naming scopes, i.e. limiting the visibility of names" could be combined with Viswanath to reject Claim 40 under 35. U.S.C. 103(a). However, Johnson's use of naming scopes can not be combined with Viswanath to

reject Claim 40. Claim 1 defined scope by stating that "scope of an MBean is a set of locations at which the MBean is available, and an MBean is not available to servers located outside the MBean's scope. Johnson's definition of scope does not meet the requirements of Claim 1, therefore Johnson and Viswanath cannot be combined to create a 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection.

Claims 41-42 were similarly subject to an improper 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection.

The examiner respectfully disagrees. It is initially noted that the examiner did and does not concede that Viswanath does not disclose scope. Scope is an inherent property of all served objects (see the discussion of claim 1 above). The examiner only concedes that Viswanath does not explicitly disclose including a 'scope' property in the disclosed meta-information files.

Further, those of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that "limiting the visibility of names" (Johnson col. 23, lines 17-18) of objects results in a system where those objects are not available to some users (i.e. the names are not 'visible' to those users and thus the object can not be accessed) thus meeting applicant's definition of 'scope'.

In the first full par. on pg. 15 (labeled Claim 43), the applicant states:

Claim 43 (as amended) requires, "wherein a request for a server specific MBean can may be handled by any MBean server in the management domain." The Office Action cited Viswanath col. 16, lines 53-57, "the generated administration framework may provide a unified view and access (via the configuration API) to administration information (persistent store 204) that may be distributed across multiple locations and multiple storages" as disclosing these features. The person of skill in the art would not believe that the cited portion of Viswanath teaches or suggests that "a request for a server specific MBean can may be handled by any MBean server in the management domain."

The examiner respectfully disagrees. Those of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the cited "unified view and access to administration information

(persistent store 204) that may be distributed across multiple locations and multiple storages" particularly in combination with the disclosure in col. 19, lines 1-3 of "a query language generic to the data storage format of the persistent store" anticipates the claimed limitation by providing a mechanism through which a request (query) can be made which will locate and provide access to a server specific bean.

In the par. bridging pp. 15-16 (labeled Claim 45), the applicant states:

Claim 45 requires "wherein when a request is received for an MBean not available on a MBean server, the MBean server calls a method that returns a list of MBeans in a management domain or a specific subset of the management domain." The Office Action conceded that Viswanath did not disclose these features, but asserted that Johnson col. 23, lines 17-18, "rule based specification of the name delimiting character; locates an object based on a longest fit because not all parts of an object name are globally known" could be combined with Viswanath's col. 19, lines 20-23 "a query mechanism" to disclose these features. The cited portion of Johnson describes Object Location Services. The cited portion does not however describe "wherein when a request is received for an MBean not available on a MBean server, the MBean server calls a method that returns a list of MBeans in a management domain or a specific subset of the management domain."

The examiner respectfully disagrees. Johnson discloses returning a list, containing at least a single object not available on a server. Those of ordinary skill in the art would recognize the proposed combination as anticipating the claimed limitation.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 42 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 42 recites the limitation "the MBean information structure" in lines 1-2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1, 18-28, 34-35, 37-39, 43-44 and 48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by US 7,206,827 to Viswanath et al. (Viswanath).

Regarding Claims 1: Viswanath discloses a computer-readable medium containing instructions stored thereon, wherein the instructions comprise:

receiving an MBean definition file in an XML format (col. 15, lines 33-35 “a meta-information file may be generated by users”; col. 20, lines 9-10 “the management beans 212 generated ... may be MBeans”; col. 3, lines 41-43 “XML by be used ... for the meta-information”);

generating an MBean jar file from the MBean definition file (col. 10, lines 3-5 “deployed applications may be stored … as jar files”), wherein the MBean jar file includes a tag for the MBean and a tag for each attribute, operation, and potential notification issued by the MBean (col. 9, lines 14-20 “meta-information 226 … includes descriptions of elements or properties, and there attributes, of the persistent store”);

placing the jar file in a predetermined directory within a managed server in a management domain (see the Table in col. 10; col. 20, lines 9-10 “the management beans 212 … may be MBeans”; Note that MBeans contain a ‘persistLocation’ descriptor field indicating The fully qualified directory where files representing the MBean should be stored.), wherein the management domain is a collection of distributed servers that are managed as a unit (see the Table in col. 10; Fig. 5, Administration server 200 and Managed beans 212A; and further see col. 12, lines 42-60 “configuration context 206 may be used to write to multiple storages on different machines with a single operation”); and

providing a custom management capability through the MBean over the management domain (col. 19, lines 66-67 “The management beans 212 may expose the management interface to the external world”);

wherein scope of an MBean is a set of locations at which the MBean is available and an MBean is not available to servers located outside the MBean’s scope (col. 2, lines 37-40 “Components may be deployed on different servers in a network”); and

wherein an administration server contains a copy of all sharable MBeans located in a management domain (Fig. 3, Generated managed beans 212).

Further, as noted in the response to arguments section the limitation stating “the management domain is a collection of distributed servers” is understood to be directed to “a collection of [two or more] distributed servers”.

Regarding Claim 18: Viswanath discloses the custom management capability tracks changes to MBeans throughout the system (col. 4, lines 46-50).

Regarding Claim 19: Viswanath discloses each server node has an MBean server (Fig. 2, Administration Server 200).

Regarding Claim 20: Viswanath discloses the custom management capability provides an API for providing management services in the management domain (col. 19, lines 66-67).

Regarding Claim 21: Viswanath discloses the custom management capability is customized by a user by adding schema attributes and extended persistence features (col. 12, lines Configuration API 222 functionality may include ... change management (e.g. add, update, delete, set); col. 14, lines 22-24 “meta-information 226 file may be generated by users ... the framework generator 224 may generate ... components”).

Regarding Claim 22: Viswanath discloses the custom management capability is packaged as a framework with multiple MBeans, which a security provider can extend (col. 5, line 55 "dynamic administration framework"; col. 15, lines 31-41 "the users may represent the configuration information in a meta-information file").

Regarding Claims 23-25: Viswanath discloses an MBean is accessed through a dynamically generated type MBean stub providing access to a java object (col. 10, lines 29-50).

Regarding Claim 26: Viswanath discloses a factory model is provided for creating MBean instances (col. 12, lines 19-23 "factory for creating the beans").

Regarding Claim 27: Viswanath discloses MBean delegates are derived from an existing MBean (col. 17, lines 10-12 "the configuration beans 210 may inherit from a common class").

Regarding Claim 28: Viswanath discloses MBeans that are declared to be persistent are automatically saved to a repository (Fig. 2, Persistent Store 204).

Regarding Claim 34: Viswanath discloses a local MBean server handles read attribute requests and MBean creation and deletion requests for server specific MBeans (col. 17,

lines 36-39 "API 222 may provide a generic interface to manage (e.g. create, read ... write and/or delete) ... the generated configuration beans 210").

Regarding Claim 35: Viswanath discloses an MBean Server Proxy routes read access to an appropriate server and MBean instance within the appropriate server and routes write accesses to the corresponding MBean instance on the administration server (Fig. 1A, Web Server 104; Application Server 108A-B).

Regarding Claim 37: Viswanath discloses changes to an MBean are propagated from an administration server to all servers within the scope of the MBean (col. 16, lines 4-18 "changes may be ... set to one or more other application servers 202").

Regarding Claim 38: Viswanath discloses applications and servers must go to a particular server to read a server-specific MBean (col. 15, lines 17-18 "In one embodiment, user applications may not be deployed to an administration server 200").

Regarding Claim 39: Viswanath discloses all MBeans residing on a managed server are stored in the managed server's local repository (Fig. 4 Generated beans 250B-C) in addition to the administration server's repository (Fig. 4, Generated beans 250A).

Regarding Claim 43: The computer-readable medium of claim 36, wherein a request for a server specific MBean may be handled by any MBean server in the management

domain (col. 16, lines 53-57 "the generated administration framework may provide a unified view and access ... to administration information").

Regarding Claim 44: Viswanath discloses accessing a server specific MBean is performed through a logical canonical server corresponding to a managed server that the server specific MBean resides upon (col. 15, lines 63-65 "The administration framework may provide a single point of access for core server, administration and application configuration").

Regarding Claim 48: Viswanath discloses an administration server handles attribute writes and MBean creation and deletion requests for sharable MBeans (col. 17, lines 36-39 "API 222 may provide a generic interface to manage (e.g. create, read ... write and/or delete) ... the generated configuration beans 210").

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 29 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 7,206,827 to Viswanath et al. (Viswanath) in view of US 5,212,784 to Sparks (Sparks).

Regarding Claim 29: Viswanath discloses MBeans are stored in separate files (col. 10, lines 3-6 "applications may be stored ... as jar files") but does not disclose MBeans are shadowed for failsafe writes.

Sparks teaches files that are shadowed for failsafe writes (col. 6, lines 47-49 "The primary controller 2 continues to mirror or shadow data").

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to shadow Viswanath's stored MBeans "If additional reliability and security are desired" (Sparks col. 6, lines 39-43).

Claims 30-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 7,206,827 to Viswanath et al. (Viswanath) in view of official notice.

Regarding Claims 30-33: The claims recite including various specific data in the tags.

Official Notice is taken that each of the datum were known and used in the art at the time of invention. Consequently, it would, at least, have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include this data in Viswanath's tags in order to provide access to the data so that it can be accessed and used in the art recognized manner.

Claims 40-42 and 45-47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 7,206,827 to Viswanath et al. (Viswanath) in view of US 6,788,980 to Johnson (Johnson).

Regarding Claims 40-42: Viswanath discloses properties of an MBean may be specified in the definition file (col. 15, lines 5-9 "The meta-information 226 may be used ... to generate components"), upon creation (col. 15, lines 33-35 "a meta information file may be generated by users") and in an information structure (col. 15, lines 1-3 "all elements or properties of the persistent store 204 may be represented in one meta-information 226 file") but does not explicitly define one of these properties as a scope.

Johnson discloses managed objects with scope properties (col. 23, lines 17-18 "supports the implementation of naming scopes, i.e., limiting the visibility of names").

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include scope as one of the properties specified by Viswanath in order to support the implementation of naming scopes as taught by Johnson (col. 23, lines 17-18).

Regarding Claim 45: Viswanath discloses requesting an MBean (col. 19, lines 20-23 "a query mechanism") but does not disclose when a request is received for an MBean not

available on a MBean server, the MBean server calls a method that returns a list of MBeans in a management domain or a specific subset of the management domain.

Johnson teaches in response to a request, returning a list of MBeans in a management domain or a specific subset of the management domain (col. 23, lines 17-18 "rule based specification of the name delimiting character; locates an object based on a "longest fit" because (a) not all parts of an object name are globally known").

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to in response to a request return a list of partial matches to Viswanath's query (col. 19, lines 20-23) because "not all parts of an object name are globally known" (Johnson col. 23, lines 17-18).

Regarding Claim 46: Viswanath discloses the MBean server uses user-provided information including a provided object name pattern to qualify a search of the list of MBeans in the management domain (col. 19, lines 20-23 "a query mechanism may be provided that uses a query language to access the persistent store 204").

Regarding Claim 47: Viswanath discloses an administration server contains a list of server specific MBeans in addition to shared MBeans (col. 16, lines 53-57 "a unified view and access").

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jason Mitchell whose telephone number is (571) 272-3728. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday and alternate Fridays 7:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bullock Lewis can be reached on (571) 272-3759. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Jason Mitchell/
3/6/08

/Lewis A. Bullock, Jr./
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2193